

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 32-34 allegedly "because of the following informalities: there are no claims 30 and 31 in the amendment. They must be renumbered consecutively. Appropriate correction is required." In response, Applicants amended claims 32-34 so as to renumber claims 32-34 as claims 30-32, respectively.

The Examiner stated that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29 and 32-34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter and have amended the claims to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being definite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner states: "Claims 1, 13, the specification doesn't describe the fluid is in direct mechanical contact with the lower surface of the substrate. At this time, it is understood as "direct contact" with the lower surface." In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to delete "mechanical" in "direct mechanical contact".

The Examiner states: "Referring to claims 24, 27, it is unclear where in the specification teaching these limitations." In response, Applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is moot, since claims 24 and 27 have been canceled.

The Examiner states: "Referring to claims 25, 28, it is unclear where in the specification teaching of these limitations." In response, Applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is moot, since claims 25 and 28 have been canceled.

The Examiner states: "Referring to claims 26, 29, paragraph [0029] appears to teach that the second fluid cause the T at the edge to be substantially the same as the rest of the wafer, but not to make it differ from the central region of the wafer." In response, Applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is moot, since claims 26 and 29 have been canceled.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain that the amendment herein has overcome the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

10/065,720

7

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being definite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states: "The specification doesn't provide the definition for "direct mechanical contact" and "no direct mechanical contact"."

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to delete "mechanical" in direct mechanical contact. Applicants have also canceled claims 24 and 27 which recited "no direct mechanical contact".

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain that the amendment herein has overcome the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 21-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0456.

Date: 03/17/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850